

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 being independent claims.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 8 and 10-11 are allowed.

Claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Pat. No.6,999,802) in view of Miramontes (US Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0072395).

Claims 3-5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Miramontes, and further in view of Sharp (U.S. Pat. No. 7,120,474) and Lenchik et al. (US Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0203485).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Miramontes, and further in view of Oh et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No.2003/0064750).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Kim, Sharp and Miramontes.

Claims 1, 5 and 12-14 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Kim in view of Miramontes renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a wireless cell phone comprising a handset; a keypad assembly rotatably coupled to the handset, the keypad assembly rotatable about a first rotation axis and about a second rotation axis perpendicular to the first rotation axis; and *a handset cover rotatably coupled to the handset and rotatable about a third rotation axis separate from and parallel to the first rotation axis, the handset cover having an interior display unit facing the handset in a folded position of the handset cover with respect to the handset.*

Kim discloses a wireless cell phone comprising a handset 10; and a keypad assembly 20 rotatably coupled to the handset 10, the keypad assembly 20 rotatable about a first rotation axis A1 and about a second rotation axis A2 perpendicular to the first rotation axis A1 (FIGs. 1, 4

and 10-12). The wireless cell phone of Kim lacks a handset cover 12 disclosed in the present application (FIGs. 1-2 and 4-5). Kim is silent about the limitation of *a handset cover rotatably coupled to the handset and rotatable about a third rotation axis separate from and parallel to the first rotation axis, the handset cover having an interior display unit facing the handset in a folded position of the handset cover with respect to the handset* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Miramontes discloses a wireless cell phone 1 comprising a handset 2 (FIG. 1); a keypad assembly 5 rotatably coupled to the handset 2 (FIGs. 1-2), the keypad assembly 5 rotatable about a first rotation axis (FIG. 2). The wireless cell phone of Miramontes lacks a handset cover 12 disclosed in the present application (FIGs. 1-2 and 4-5). Miramontes fails to disclose the limitation of *a handset cover rotatably coupled to the handset and rotatable about a third rotation axis separate from and parallel to the first rotation axis, the handset cover having an interior display unit facing the handset in a folded position of the handset cover with respect to the handset* taught by Amended Claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Kim.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Kim, Miramontes, or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Kim in view of Miramontes and further in view of Oh et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 12 teaches, in part, a wireless cell phone comprising a handset; a handset cover rotatably coupled to the handset; and *a keypad assembly removably coupled to the handset, the keypad assembly having a first side on which a telephone keypad is disposed and a second side on which a QWERTY key arrangement is disposed.*

Kim discloses a wireless cell phone comprising a handset 10; and a keypad assembly 20 rotatably coupled to the handset 10, the keypad assembly 20 rotatable about a first rotation axis A1 and about a second rotation axis A2 perpendicular to the first rotation axis A1 (FIGs. 1, 4 and 10-12). In the Office Action section 4. on page 6, the Examiner alleges that Kim discloses “a keypad assembly removably coupled to the handset” (emphasis added), and cites FIGs. 4, 10-12; col. 4 line 60 to col. 5 line 5 and col. 6 lines 15-22 of Kim as support for the allegation.

Applicant respectfully traverses the allegation. The citations by the Examiner unmistakably show that the keypad assembly 20 of Kim is rotatably, but not removably, coupled to the handset 10. Kim further asserts the rotatably coupling of the keypad assembly to the handset in Abstract and in each of independent Claims 1 and 6. Kim hints nowhere that the keypad assembly 20 is removable. By contrast, the keypad assembly 18 of the present application is removable (FIGs 7-8). Kim is silent about the limitation of *a keypad assembly removably coupled to the handset, the keypad assembly having a first side on which a telephone keypad is disposed and a second side on which a QWERTY key arrangement is disposed* taught by Amended Claim 12.

Miramontes discloses a wireless cell phone 1 comprising a handset 2 (FIG. 1); a keypad assembly 5 rotatably coupled to the handset 2 (FIGs. 1-2), the keypad assembly 5 rotatable about a first rotation axis (FIG. 2). Miramontes hints nowhere that the keypad assembly 5 is removable. By contrast, the keypad assembly 18 of the present application is removable (FIGs 7-8). Miramontes fails to disclose the limitation of *a keypad assembly removably coupled to the handset, the keypad assembly having a first side on which a telephone keypad is disposed and a second side on which a QWERTY key arrangement is disposed* taught by Amended Claim 12, and thus fails to cure the defects of Kim.

Oh et al. discloses a wireless cell phone comprising a handset 10; and a keypad assembly 30 rotatably coupled to the handset 10, the keypad assembly 30 rotatable about a first rotation axis A, the keypad assembly 30 having a first side 30a on which a telephone keypad 311 is disposed and a second side 30b on which contact use projectors 311a are disposed (FIGs 1-5, paragraphs [0021] and [0026]). Oh et al. hints nowhere that the keypad assembly 30 is removable. By contrast, the keypad assembly 18 of the present application is removable (FIGs 7-8). Oh et al. is silent about the limitation of *a keypad assembly removably coupled to the handset, the keypad assembly having a first side on which a telephone keypad is disposed and a second side on which a QWERTY key arrangement is disposed* taught by Amended Claim 12, and thus fails to cure the defects of Kim and Miramontes.

Clearly, Amended Claim 12 structurally differs from Kim, Miramontes, Oh et al., or any

combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Oh et al. in view of Kim, Sharp and Miramontes renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 13, as well as Amended Claim 12, teaches the limitation of *a keypad assembly removably coupled to the handset, the keypad assembly having a first side on which a telephone keypad is disposed and a second side on which a QWERTY key arrangement is disposed*, which each of Oh et al., Kim, and Miramontes fails to disclose as presented in the rationale for Amended Claim 12.

Sharp discloses a wireless cell phone 2 comprising a handset 4 and a handset cover 6 rotatably coupled to the handset 4 (FIG. 2b). Sharp also fails to disclose the limitation of *a keypad assembly removably coupled to the handset, the keypad assembly having a first side on which a telephone keypad is disposed and a second side on which a QWERTY key arrangement is disposed* taught by Amended Claim 13, and thus fails to cure the defects of Oh et al., Kim, and Miramontes.


Clearly, Amended Claim 13 structurally differs from Kim, Miramontes, Oh et al., Sharp, or any combination thereof.

App. No. 10/692,189

PATENT APPLICATION  
Attorney Docket No. 678-1510 (P11887)

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the application, namely, Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MJ Musella", written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Musella  
Reg. No. 39,310  
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard  
Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel 516-228-3565  
Fax 516-228-8475

MJM/DGL/mk